



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—THE ORIGIN OF THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE.

1. The origin of the gerund and gerundive, in spite of all the attempts of scholars, can hardly yet be considered satisfactorily elucidated.

In the American Journal of Philology, vol. IX, 2 and 4 (1888), Mr. S. B. Platner set forth clearly and in detail the statistics of the use of the gerund and gerundive in Pliny's Letters and in Tacitus' Annals, and more recently, in vol. XIV, 4 (Dec. 1893), he has done the same for Plautus and Terence. The latter is the more important for us, as the language was nearer the primitive form in the time of Plautus and Terence. The result of his analysis shows that in Early Latin the gerund is more frequently used than the gerundive. "Exactly the opposite," he says, "was found to be the case in Silver Latin, as was to be expected, especially if it is assumed that the latter is a development from the former." Of this more hereafter. Mr. Platner, however, is concerned with the *uses*, not the *origin* of the gerund and gerundive.

As regards the origin:—Brugmann in the Grundriss, II, §69 (1889), derived the *-ndo-* from *-tno-*, comparing the Lithuanian verbals in *-tinas* (see A. J. P. VIII 441-7). Professor Conway (Class. Rev. V, p. 297, July, 1891) showed the weak points in this comparison, and Brugmann (Gr. II, §1103, 3, 1892) has withdrawn his former conjecture, at the same time adding that he is unable to accept Conway's own conjecture (Cl. Rev. V 296 sqq.) (which is itself only a repetition of Curtius' view given in the second edition of his Greek Etymology, p. 590) or those put forward by Thurneysen (*-mn-* in Latin—Die Bildung des ital. Gerundivums—Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 493 ff.) and Mr. Dunn (Cl. Rev. VI 1 sqq.). He then proceeds in a long 'Remark' to give a new theory of his own which in some respects is excellent.

He says that the inquiries of Weisweiler have rendered it highly probable that the meaning of 'deed to be accomplished' belonged to the gerundive from the beginning, and further, that the gerund (which does not appear in the Umbr.-Samn. monu-

ments) was first developed from the gerundive when, e. g., to *virtus colenda est* was formed *colendum est*, as 'modus impersonalis.' The fact that in Early Latin the gerund is more frequently employed than the gerundive proves nothing against this, for the gerund arose to fill the gap created by the loss in Latin of the Prim. Ital. infin. in *-m*, which still survived in Umbrian and Oscan—that is, it arose in Latin as an abstract noun, and as such was naturally in frequent use. Further, says Brugmann, as the other Indo-Germanic languages, so far as one has yet been able to see, offer nothing wherewith to connect the suffixal ending of the Italic gerundive, it is *a priori* credible that this developed itself on Italic soil, on the ground of the final infinitive, just as German 'der zu lobende, ein zu lobender' on the ground of 'zu loben,' Skr. *ḡravāy-iyas* 'laudandus' on the ground of the infinitive **ḡravāi*. On this he bases his new conjecture.

He starts with the Primitive Ital. accus. infin. in *-m*, e. g. Umbr. *fašiu(m)*, *fero(m)*. This, he says, was combined with the postposition **dō* or **de* (for which he compares Latin *en-do indu*, *dō-nicum dō-nec*, Avestic *vaēsman-da* 'to the house, home,' Greek *ἡμέτερόν-δε* and *ἡμέτερον δᾶ*), with the meaning of the German 'zu with the infinitive.' *-md-* must have already in Primitive Italic become *-nd-* (cf. Old Latin *quan-de*, Umbr. *pane* (= 'quam'), etc., Grundriss, I 207),¹ and thus the combination with the postposition acquired an isolated place compared with the other infin. in *-m*.

Lastly, adjectives of the *o*-declension were made to the forms in *-dō* or *-de*, just as the adjectives *subiugu-s*, *antenovissimu-s*, *perfidu-s* arose to *sub iugō*, *ante novissimum*, *per fidem*.

Brugmann gives two alternative theories to explain the forms such as *plendu-s videndu-s flandu-s arandu-s*:—(1) They may come from a primitive form **plē-m* **vidē-m* **flā-m* **arā-m* in the sense of *plēre*, *vidēre*, etc.; cf. the Avestic *dam* 'to place, give' (Grundriss, II, §1089, 1), in which case *plendu-s arandu-s* Osc.

¹ *-nd-* is, as a general rule, the form shown by inscriptions, but the Lex Iulia Municipalis (B. C. 44), C. I. L. I 206, presents nine instances of the gerundive spelt with *-md-*, viz. *damdum*, *damdam*, *tuemdum*, *tuemdarum*, *faciumdēi*, beside thirty-two spelt with *-nd-*, e. g. *tuendam*. These nine instances show the earlier form of the gerundive according to Brugmann's theory and my own (v. infra), but as I cannot find any other instance of the gerund or gerundive so spelt in the C. I. L., it seems improbable that any etymological value should be attached to the *-md-* in these nine instances.

úpsannam would contain these older infinitive forms unchanged. For Latin *rotundu-s*, *rubicundu-s* we must then assume the infin. **rotō-m* **rubicō-m* (cf. *aegrō-tu-s*); *rotundu-s* for **rotondo-s* as *latrunculus* for **latron-culu-s*; *ferendo-s* arose in Pr. Ital. from **ferondo-s* (*ferundu-s*) beside present participle *ferent-*, on analogy of *arandu-s* *videndu-s* beside the present participle *arant-* *vident-*. Or (2) possibly Osc. *fatíum*, *censaum*, Umbr. *stiplo(m)* (for **stiplā-om*) 'stipulari' came from Primitive Italic *-ē-īom *-ā-īom (cf. 1 s. pres. in *-ē-īō *-ā-īō), and corresponding to these there had existed -ē(ī)on-do-, -ā(ī)on-do- (cf. Latin *faciundu-s* to Umbr. *fašiu(m)* 'facere'). The relation of **ferondo-* to the participial stem **feront-* (cf. *eunt-*, etc., §126) would have caused not only *ferendo-* on analogy of *ferent-*, but also *arando-videndo-* on analogy of *arant-* *vident-*. By this means we may explain *rotundu-s* *rubicundu-s* as proceeding regularly from **rotā(ī)ondo-* **rubicā(ī)ondo-* through the intermediate stage **rotōndo-* **rubicōndo-* (cf. 1 s. *rotō* for **rotā-(ī)ō*).

In contrast to *rotandu-s*, *rubicandu-s* they held fast the original form of the infin., since they had quite early become pure adjectives.

Of these two views, Brugmann prefers the second.

2. Brugmann is probably right in thus starting from Prim. Italic to explain the gerund and gerundive, and I would follow him thus far in starting with Prim. Italic accus. infin. in -*m*, e. g. Umbr. *fero(m)*, *fašiu(m)*, as basis; but his theory of explanation by means of the postposition **dō* or **de* seems to me very unlikely. Postposition undoubtedly occurs frequently in Umbr. Samnite, e. g. Umbr. *manuv-e* 'in manu,' *ebetraf-e* 'ad exitus,' Oscan *húrtín* for *hortei* (locative) or *hortoi* (dative) + *en* (Bréal); cf. Latin *tecum*, *quem ad* beside *ad quem*.

Brugmann (in Grundriss, II, §162, rem. 2¹) explains the Latin² passive infin. in -*ier* also by postposition: he conjectures that -*er* represents the preposition *ar* (*arbiter ar-vorsus*), which appears to be of dialectic origin (I, §369, rem. 1). For the change of -*ar* to -*er* see I, §97, 3, and he compares *in-ers arti-fex im-ertiō*; and for the position of the word he compares *quem ad* beside

¹ Cf. also Grundr. II, §1094, 3.

² Deecke, reading *doivom atoier pactia(nt)* 'sacrum agi vovent' in the *Marsian* inscr. (Zvetaieff No. 45), explains *atoier* as infin. passive = **āctu-ier* 'agi.' If Deecke is right, this pass. infin. in -*ier* is not confined to Latin.

ad quem and Umbr. *asam-ař* 'ad aram.' He continues that it need not surprise us to find at so early a stage of Latin, the combination of the infinitive with a preposition which is established in the Romance languages (cf. *ad* before the infinitive, as Ital. *ho a scrivere*¹), since even in Latin the infinitive had again approximated to the noun, and at least *inter* and *praeter* were used with it, e. g. *nūl praeter plorāre* (Hor.).² But this theory has not met with general acceptance; Stolz (Latin Grammar, p. 380) gives a more plausible theory to explain these forms.³

It is true that the infinitive was originally an abstract substantive, and as such presumably might have a preposition postfixed to it; but if so, it can only have taken place in Prim. Italic before the infinitive lost its original use as a substantive pure and simple, and must have died out very soon, for otherwise we should expect to find at least some trace of it on inscriptions; but there is none such whatever to warrant the assumption that it ever took place. Thus it seems that there is nothing which can bear out Brugmann's theory of postposition in the explanation of (1) the pass. infin. in *-ier*; (2) the gerundive.

Assuming, however, that the gerundive be rightly thus explained, let us see what it can mean. It can hardly mean more than 'to the doing' (cf. English 'to do'); it could not *originally* be passive, 'deed to be done,' the meaning which Brugmann would give to it. It might of course gradually shade into such a passive meaning (cf. *facile dictu* 'easy to say' is much the same as 'easy to be said'), but it cannot have had it originally.

Nor, again, does the German 'der zu lobende, ein zu lobender' seem to me to be a good parallel. It is true that there is a preposition in the composition of these German phrases, but the second part is a *bona fide* present participle active, whereas that can hardly be said of the Italic gerundive.

It may also be mentioned, by the way, that the derivation given

¹ To quote from an author: "Il suocero, che ben sapeva d' averla a dare, tutta l' aveva provista," 'The father-in-law, who well understood to have to give it, had provided it altogether.' Fortini, Nov. II, p. 287, in *Novelle di Autori Fiorentini e Senesi* (Torino, 1853). This is a good example, showing two infinitives governed by different prepositions.

² Compare also *hic vereri* (= *verecundiam*) *perdidit*, Plaut. Bacch. I, 2, 50, and *nostrum istud vivere triste*, Persius, I 9.

³ F. Müller (Grundr. der Sprachwiss. III 2, 650 f.) explains *-er* in these forms as the passive exponent, and Brugmann (Gr. II, §1094, 3, rem.) compares Osc. *vincter* 'vincitur,' karanter 'pascunter.'

of ἡμέτερον δῶ (v. Fick, Verg. Wörterbuch der Idg. Sprachen, I, p. 458) is hardly likely to receive much favour¹; for other explanations of it *vide* Brugmann, Gr. II, §223, rem. 3 (Engl. ed., vol. III, p. 102).

3. I would venture to suggest another theory for the origin of the gerundive and gerund, based, as Brugmann's, on the Prim. Ital. infinitive in *-m*, e. g. (to take a different word) the Oscan infin. *edum* 'eating' or 'to eat.' To this infinitive² as basis was added the suffix *-do*, which appears in adjectives such as *imbridu-s*, *lucidu-s* (for which cf. Osthoff, Verb. in der Nominal-comp. 121 ff.; Thurneysen, Ueber die Herkunft und Bildung der lat. Verba auf *-io*, 1879, p. 13; and Corssen, Krit. Beitr., pp. 97-9. Cf. also Brugmann, Gr. II, §128). This suffix *-do* may, so far as Latin alone is concerned, represent either Idg. $\sqrt{d\bar{o}}$ 'give' or possibly $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ 'place,' or rather 'make,' since the Idg. $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ had lost its meaning 'place' in Italic, and retained only that of 'to make.'

Thielmann (Das Verbum *dare* im Lateinischen, Leipzig, 1882) gives reasons to support the theory that often in Latin we find *dare* used with the sense of $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ instead of with that of $\sqrt{d\bar{o}}$. Cf. Dr. Postgate, Transactions of the Philological Society, 1880-81, p. 99 f., where he suggests that there was a pair of roots in Indo-Germanic, *da-* and *dha-*, with much the same meaning, and that in some languages the two roots were preserved with differentiated meaning (e. g. Greek and Sanskrit), and in other languages (e. g. Latin and Avestic) one was lost and the survivor had to do duty for both. Cf. also his remarks in the Academy, 1882, No. 552, p. 400. Brugmann, Litterarisches Centralblatt, 1882, No. 41, col. 1390, objects that Idg. *dh* at the beginning of a word becomes *f* (as in *felare*, *fumus*), and not *d*; from $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ in all probability come *faber* and *facio*, hence we should expect **fare* τῑθένα beside *dare* διδόναι. But in the Grundriss, I, §370, 1888, he shows that in the middle of a word in some cases we find Idg. *dh* represented in Latin by *d*; instances are *mediu-s*:

¹ Streitberg, in his recent essay, Idg. Forsch., vol. III, p. 331, fairly disproves this explanation of δῶ. One of his objections is that the circumflex is thus left quite unexplained.

² That the infinitive in *-m* should be thus used as a substantive need not surprise us, if we consider its origin; we may well compare the Skr. infinitives made from the root-noun, and from the noun in *tu*, which, amongst other uses, we find in the accusative as object of a verb, e. g. *ṣak-* 'be able,' *dhṛ-* 'undertake,' *arh-* 'be worthy, have the right,' *vid-* 'know' (v. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §981).

Skr. *mādhyā-s*, Gk. Hom. μέσσο-ς from *μεθιο-ς, Pr. Idg. *medhjo-; *aedēs aedilis*: Skr. *édha-s*, Gk. αἶθ-ω from √ *aidh*- 'glow'; *vidua*: Skr. *vidhāvā*; *fīdō*: Gk. πείθω, gr. *bhéjdhō from √ *bhejdh*, and *con-dō* from **con-dh-ō*, *con-ditu-s*¹ beside *fa-c-iō* from √ *dhē*- 'place,' hence it is possible that **dare* = '(place), make' originally arose from compounds such as *con-dō*; at any rate, Brugmann's criticism would not affect the suffix -*do*, for the *d* here would come in the middle of the compounded word, just as it does in *con-dō*.²

In SANSKRIT we find the two roots used almost synonymously in e. g.

<i>artha-da-s</i>	'bringing benefit, generous,'
<i>gara-da-s</i>	'giving poison,'
<i>garbha-da-s</i>	} (Vedic) 'causing or giving a birth, impregnating,'
and <i>garbha-dhā-s</i>	
<i>jala-da-s</i>	'giving water,'
<i>māna-da-s</i>	'giving self-respect, pride-giving,'
<i>a-doma-dā-s</i>	} (both Vedic) 'causing no pain.'
and <i>a-doma-dhā-s</i>	

From the Rīg-Veda alone we have—

compounds with *dā* :

jani-dā-
sahasra-dā
vāja-dā-
dhana-dā-
ātma-dā-
hiraṇya-dā-
vastra-dā-
bala-dā-
aṣva-dā-
anaṣva-dā-
vasu-dā-
go-dā-
ojo-dā-
etc., etc.

compounds with *dhā* :

jani-dhā- (of uncertain meaning)
sahasra-dhā-
ratna-dhā-
apa-dhā-
nāma-dhā-
sarva-dhā-
madhu-dhā-
vīpo-dhā-
vayo-dhā-
varivo-dhā-
dhiyam-dhā- (quoted above)
etc., etc.

¹ The compounds of √ *dhē*- and √ *dō*- were confused in Latin, beginning with the 1st and 2d plural, -*dī*- = (1) **-fa*- **-dh-ē-*, (2) **-da*- **-dō-* (v. Brugmann, Gr. II, §505, rem. 2).

² Brugmann (Gr. II, §688) assigns to the √ *dō*-, besides the meaning 'give,' also a similar meaning to √ *dhē*-.

Of the former Grassmann gives twenty-four instances in all, of the latter sixteen. We should especially note the last example quoted, *dhiyam-dhā* 'thought-directing,' for in this compound the first member is still seen in the accusative case governed by the root *dhā*-.

In LATIN it is very common, especially from verbs of the *e*-conjugation; e. g. *rubi-du-s*, *ari-du-s* *umi-du-s* *liqui-du-s* *madi-du-s*, *algi-du-s* *cali-du-s* (and *caldus*) *torri-du-s* *frigi-du-s* *tepi-du-s* *fervi-du-s*, *niti-du-s* *splendi-du-s* *fulgi-du-s* *candi-du-s* *albi-du-s*, *timi-du-s* *pavi-du-s*,¹ beside which we must compare the substantives ending in *-ē-do*, e. g.

rubē-do albē-do frigē-do

From a verb of the *i*-conjugation we have

cupi-du-s beside *cupī-do* (and *cupē-do*) and Old Latin *cupī-re*

From verbs whose stems end in *-i* in the present:

sapi-du-s in-sipi-du-s beside *sapi-ō*
rapi-du-s beside *rapi-ō*

From verbs of consonant conjugation:

vivi-du-s
flui-du-s

Also from nominal stems:

herbi-du-s from *herba*
morbi-du-s " *morbo-*
imbri-du-s " *imbri-*
geli-du-s " *gelu*

For instance of the later loss of the *i*, cf. e. g.

caldus (mentioned above) beside *cali-du-s*
valde " *vali-du-s*
soldus " *solī-du-s*
ardus (Lucil.) " *ārī-du-s*

¹ These adjectives are, I believe, usually derived from the substantives in *-es*, where such exist beside them, e. g. *frigus*, *liquor*. In support of this derivation for the adjectives, the dative-ablative in *-ibus* is generally quoted. J. Schmidt explained *-ibus* as coming from **-ez-bhos*, but Thurneysen (Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 489) opposed this theory, and Brugmann (Gr. II, §397, rem. 2) supports him emphatically in his opposition.

In all these instances (pace Victor Henry, who condemns this view as "peu vraisemblable," *Précis de Gramm. comparée du Grec et du Latin*, §163 (3)) the suffix *-do-* means 'giving,' or perhaps 'causing,' e. g. 'giving forth redness, heat, dampness, moisture, coolness, warmth,' etc.¹

In GREEK this suffix is hardly to be found,² but Greek uses the suffix *-φóρος* (from the verb *φέρω*) in an exactly parallel way :

ἀστραπή-φóρος	beside Latin <i>fulgi-du-s</i>
φωσ-φóρος	" { <i>luci-du-s</i> <i>luci-fer</i>
ὀμβρο-φóρος	" { <i>imbri-fer</i> <i>imbri-du-s</i>
κερασ-φóρος } κερο-φóρος }	" { <i>corni-fer</i> <i>corni-ger</i> (cf. perhaps Greek κόρυ-δο-ς, supra).

¹ Vide infra on Umbr. *kaleřuf*.

² Although the suffixes *-dho-* and *-do-* are not frequent in forming Greek nouns like Lat. *rubidus*, etc., yet we often find the *-dh-* and *-d-* used otherwise, e. g. the *dh-* suffix in forms like βρέ-θω πλέ-θω φλεγε-θω has often been referred to *√dhē-* 'place,' and likewise the *d-* suffix in certain cases was considered as from the *√dō-*, which (according to Brugmann, II, §688), beside the meaning 'give,' had also a like meaning to *√dhē-*. (On these suffixes see especially Brugmann, Gr. II, §§694, 695.) We may perhaps see the *√dhē-* in the *-dhi*, which is a method of forming the 2 s. imperat. act. in Aryan Greek and Baltic-Slavonic, e. g. Skr. *viddhi*, Gk. *ισθι*, Old Lith. *veisdi*, from **uid-dhi* from *√uid-*; Gk. *δρνυ-θι* beside *δρ-νῦ*, Skr. *ζ-नु*, to *δρνῶμι* 'I stir'; Skr. *ग्र-नु-धत्* and *ग्र-नु-ही* beside *ग्र-नु* to 3 s. indic. *ग्र-न्θ-ति* 'hears.' *-dhi* : *-hi* = *-dhita* : *hita*. This *-dhi* became so crystallized in this use that it was even added to form the imperative of its own root *dhē-*, e. g. Skr. *dhēhi* from Pr. Aryan **dha-s-dhi*. The literal meaning would then be 'make the knowing, the stirring, the hearing,' etc. The *i* of *-dhi* may be due to the analogy of *-si*, the Idg. personal ending of 2 s. pres. indic. act., especially as indicative forms were used (along with others) as imperative, e. g. Skr. 2 s. *vé-ṣi* 'come hither,' *kṣé-ṣi* 'delay,' *sáti-si* 'seat thyself,' *prá-si* 'fill,' Gk. *λέξαι* from **lek-s-sai* 'lay thyself' (cf. Brugmann, Gr. II, §§956, 969, 2). (On this *i* in *-mi*, *-si*, *-ti*, *-nti*, as contrasted with *-m*, *-s*, *-t*, *-nt*, cf. Brugmann, Gr. II, §973, who there regards it as possibly a particle indicating present time, and §463, 1, where he regards it as probably a demonstrative particle.) This explanation of *-dhi* is supported by the fact that Brugmann sees *√dhē-* also in the Aryan dat. infin. in *-dhīāi*, e. g. Skr. *váha-dhyāi*, Av. *vasaīdyāi* 'to drive, carry,' beside which are found in like function *-dhēyāya* *-dhāi* *-dhē* (v. Grundr. II, §§1088. 9, 1089. 12), and in Greek mid. pass. infin. in *-σθαι*, which seems to have originated with words like *εἶδεσθαι*, which were wrongly analysed as *εἶδε-σθαι* beside *εἶδε-ται* (v. Grundr. II, §1093, 8).

νυκτι-φόρος	beside Latin <i>nocti-fer</i> 'the evening star'
ὀδυνη-φόρος	" <i>morbi-du-s</i>
ξίφη-φόρος } ξίφο-φόρος }	" { <i>ensi-fer</i> <i>ensi-ger</i>
σελασ-φόρος	" <i>splendi-du-s</i>
ἀνθεσ-φόρος	" <i>flori-du-s</i>
σαπρο-φόρος	" { <i>feti-du-s</i> <i>puti-du-s</i> ¹

From these examples it seems clear that nothing prevents the suffix *-do-* from being derived from a verbal root, either $\sqrt{d\bar{o}}$ - or $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ -, or both. On the whole, I decide in favour of $\sqrt{d\bar{o}}$ - rather than of $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ -, because, although *dh* could become *d* in Latin (see above), yet it can hardly have become anything except *f* in Umbr.-Osc.,² and so we should have to regard the gerundive as borrowed by Umbr.-Osc. from Latin, if we were to determine *dh-* as the primitive ground-form.³ Moreover, on account of Umbr. *kaleřuf*, *calersu* = 'calidos' or 'callidos' where *řrs* is the result of *d* (not *dh*) between vowels, it is more probable that we should trace $\sqrt{d\bar{o}}$ - than $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ - in the Latin adjectives in *-du-s* (given above). My view, then, is that to form the gerundive this suffix *-do-* was added in Pr. Ital. to the Pr. Ital. infinitive (a substantive) in *-m*, and governed the infinitive as its object. This explanation, moreover, receives much support from the fact that in the case of "Gerundives used in a passive sense in the predicate, after certain verbs, to denote the object of their action" (Mr. Platner in A. J. P. XIV 4, 1893), *dare* is by far the most frequent verb, e. g.

Dato excrucandum me. Plaut. Mil. 567.

Te elinguendam dederō. Id. Aul. 250.

Statuam faciundam dare. Id. Curc. 440.

Anulum utendum dederat. Id. 603.

"It will be seen," says the writer, "that this usage is almost a stereotyped formula, and that in Plautus, in two-thirds of all the

¹ I do not imply by these comparisons that *every one* of the Latin instances shews clearly a nominal form before *-do-*, and so far they are not *all* strictly parallel to the Greek.

² Oscan *aīdil* 'aedilis' from $\sqrt{aīdh}$ - 'glow' was a Latin loan-word (Brugmann, Gr. I, §370).

³ Mr. Dunn (Class. Rev. VI, p. 3) was unable to decide between $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ - and $\sqrt{d\bar{o}}$ - as the origin of *-do-s*. The Umbr.-Samn. forms (unless borrowed) will admit only of the latter.

cases of its occurrence, it is with the verb *dare*, and in four more with *locare*. In Terence the proportion is somewhat less, but the inference seems warranted that the ordinary earliest use was with *dare*, and one or two verbs like *locare* and *conducere*, and that its use with other verbs like *petere* and *rogare* was the result of analogy and a somewhat later development."

We find exactly the same use of *dare* in Osc. *trííbúm ekak* ... *úpsannam deded* 'domum hanc ... operandam dedit' (Zvetaieff, *Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial.*, No. 143; cf. also Nos. 96, 97, 145).

The close connection here visible between *dare* and the gerundive seems to support my theory.

4. There is no real objection to my theory that the *-do-* governs a case here, for compare e. g.

In SANSKRIT, especially in Vedic, where we might expect to find compounds in the primitive stage of formation (i. e. that of a syntactical combination), such compounds as

Vedic	{	<i>dhiyam̐dha</i> 'thought-directing' (quoted above)
		<i>dhiyam̐jinva</i> 'thought-furthering'
		<i>dhanam̐jayá</i> 'wealth-winning'
		<i>puram̐dará</i> 'city-destroying'
		<i>abhayam̐kará</i> 'causing absence of danger'
		<i>samudram̐ñkhaya</i> 'sea-exciting'
		<i>puṣṭimbhará</i> 'prosperity-bringing'
		<i>vájam̐bhará</i> 'booty-winning'
		<i>arim̐dama</i> 'foe-taming'
		<i>viṣvambhará</i> 'all-supporting'
		<i>vācam̐ñkhayá</i> 'voice-inciting'
		<i>abhram̐liha</i> 'cloud-licking'
		<i>param̐tapa</i> 'foe-vexing.'

Add also (for the accusative is often found in Skr. as object of verbs of 'going' and the like, which in the related languages are not transitive,¹ e. g. *divam̐ yayuh̐* 'they went to heaven'; cf. Whitney, *Skr. Gr.* §274 a):

patam̐gá (Vedic) 'going to flight, flying'
hṛdayam̐gama 'heart-touching'
sāgaram̐gama 'sea-going.'

¹ Cf. in Italic the accus. of the supine used after verbs of motion, e. g. Lat. *datum eo*, Umbr. *aseriato eest* 'observatum ibit' (whence arose the so-called fut. infin. pass. *datum iri*); the same use of the accus. in *-tu-m* we find also in Skr. and Balto-Slavonic.

In all these compounds the first member is an accusative case governed by a root-stem or a derivative in *a* of equivalent meaning. Cf. Whitney, *Skr. Gr.* §§1250 *a*, 1269 *b*, 1270 *c*.

Similarly

AVESTIC: *ahūmer^{nc}* (*ahūm*, acc. of *ahu* 'world,' governed by root *marec*) 'world-destroying' beside *ahu-mer^c*.¹

māthremperesa (*māthrem*, acc. of *māthra* 'word, holy writ,' governed by root *pareś* = *Skr. prach-* 'ask') 'one who has studied the Avesta.'

vīreñjan (from *vīrem*, acc. of *vīra* 'man,' governed by root *jan*) 'man-slaying,' beside *vīra-jan-*, *Skr. vīra-hān-*.

drujemvana (from *drujem*, acc. of *druj*, name of some female demons, governed by root *van* 'conquer') 'female-demon-conquering.'

vīspā-hiśant- (acc. pl. neuter of *vīspā-*) 'able to do everything.'

ARMENIAN: *mels-a-sēr* 'loving sins,' *mels*, acc. pl. of *mel-* (for this *-a-*, the vowel of composition, v. Brugmann, *Gr. II*, §28, 1).

stn-dē 'sucking the breast, suckling' (*stin*, gen. *stean* 'woman's breast') may possibly be an instance in point (v. Brugmann, *ibid.*, rem. 2).

GREEK: *δικασπόλος* from **δικανς-πολος*.

μογοσ-τόκος from **μογονς-τοκος*.

νουν-εχόντως and *νουν-έχης* as if from a verb *νουνέχω*.

From *ἀταλὰ φρονέων*, *ἀταλα-φρονέων*, we get *ἀταλάφρων*.

πυρ-φόρος beside *πυροφόρος*.

ἀμφορεᾶ-φόρος.

ποδα-νιπτήρ, *ποδά-νιπτρον*, beside *χέρνιψ* and *χερόνιπτρον*.

μῦσ-φόνος beside *μυοφόνος*.

βιβλί-γραφος (Cratin. *Χειρ.* 18; but v. Lob. *Phryn.* 655) beside *βιβλιόγραφος*.

βιβλια-φόρος beside *βιβλιόφορος*.

παν-όπτης beside *παντόπτης*.

ὄνομα-θέτης (but Lob. *Phryn.* 688 corrects to *ὀνοματο-θέτης*). Cf.

ὀνομακλήδην, *ὀνομακλήτωρ* (late), *nomenclator* below, and *ὀνομάκλυτος*, on which vide Victor Henry, *Préc. de Gram. Comp.*, §176.

φωσ-φόρος beside *φαισφόρος* and *φωτοφόρος*.

¹ One *m* is dropped in *ahūmer^{nc}* for **ahūmm^{nc}*; Avestic allows no double consonants, v. Jackson's *Av. Gr.*, part II, §186. Brugmann is therefore wrong in writing it with double *m*, in *Grundriss*, II, §§27 and 163.

κερασ-φόρος beside κεροφόρος.

κωλα-κρέτης, the form given by Photius and Suidas, is sometimes derived from κῶλα (acc. pl. of κῶλον) and κείρω. The Schol. Aristoph. and Timae. quote the form with a γ, κωλα-γρέτης, which is supposed to come from ἀγείρω.

χοα-χνητής is quoted by one German writer, but Hesychius does not know the form, and Liddell and Scott omit it.

καρη-κομόωντες 'long-haired,' from κάρη and κομάω; cf. the phrase τὰς κεφαλὰς κομᾶσαι used of the women of a certain Libyan tribe in Hdt. IV 168.

In some, however, of these (e. g. μῦσ-φόνος) the first member is explained by others as the stem, and not the accusative case (cf. Brugmann, Gr. II, §29), but there is not much argument either way; the existence of the forms μνοφόνος κεροφόρος, etc., beside μῦσφόνος κερασφόρος seems to favor my explanation of these latter forms. (For instances of other cases which are perhaps more commonly used, cf. ἄλοσάχνη Διόσδοτος πυλογενής δορίληπτος.) On these compounds generally, vide G. Meyer, C. St. 6, 382 ff., and Clemm, C. St. 7, 95 f.

ITALIC:

Latin: *vindex* from **vim-dex* 'one who shows the violence,' i. e. 'the avenger' (Schweizer-Sidler, Latin Gr.², explain this as from **vēnundex* 'one who shows the penalty-price'; but if so, why is it not *vendex*, like *vendo*?).

*iudex*¹ from **iouz-dic-s* 'one who shows the law,' i. e. 'the judge' (cf. Avestic *yaoždath-* infra), beside *iuridicus*.

iu(s)-stiliūm.

Oscan: *μεδδειξ*¹ from **medos* (= Umbr. *meřs*)—*deix*, **medos* becoming in Oscan by syncope **meds*, and the voiced *s* falling out before *d* (cf. *nīdus* from **ni-zd-o-s*).

Latin: *nomenclator*. Here *nomen* may be accusative case governed by the second member of the compound. Cf. Gk. *ὄνομα-θέτης*, supra, and *ὄνομα-κλυτος* (Brugmann, Gr. II, §§12, 29, takes it as the stem, -*en-* being simply from -*η-*).

domuitio from **domum-itio*² may be compared with Sanskrit *sāgarāṅgama* above.

¹ *iudex* and *μεδδειξ* might of course be explained as containing the stem and not an accusative case, but *vindex* seems to favour the explanation which I have given.

² Cf. the periphrastic fut. infin. pass., e. g. *datum iri*, where fusion of the two words is attested in the writing -*tūri* for -*tum iri* (vide Brandt, Arch. f. lat. Lexikogr. II 349 ff.; Schmalz, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1892, p. 79 f.).

mus-cipula 'a mouse-trap.' Is *mus* perhaps a fossilized acc. plural formed on analogy of the *u*-stems, e. g. *manūs* (cf. Gk. *μῦς* *μῦς*, a reformat following *ὄφρυς* *ὄφρυς*)? Compare, beside it, *muricidus*.

Lariscolus = probably 'is qui Lares colit' (cf. Skutsch, De nominum Lat. compositione), beside which compare *Larifuga*.

legiscrepa, *νομοδίφας* gloss Philox. (Forcellini presumably regards this as a mistake of the scribe for *legicrepa*, which is the form which he quotes); compare *legirupa*.

forasgerones, cf. Forcellini, s. v. *foras*, nota. 2) Item *foras* usurpatum tanquam nomen reperitur apud Aggen. de contr. agr., p. 53, Goës. 3) Per hyphen composuit Plaut. Truc. 2. 7. 1, *foras-gerones*. *foras* is probably an accus. plur., of which perhaps *foris* was the ablative, from an obsolete noun *fora* = Skr. *dvār*, Gk. *θύρα*. (Brugmann, Gr. II, §358, suggests that *forās* 'outside, out of doors' may be a loc. plur., but says that *forās* 'out, outwards' is accusative.)

We may add also here two Plautine comic names:

Argentumexterebronides, Plaut. Pers. 4. 6. 21 (but Forcellini prefers to read *argentiexterebronides* or *argenti exterebronides*), beside *argentifodina* 'a silver-mine.'

Quodsemelarrripides, id. 4. 6. 22, from *quod semel* + *arripio*, = 'is qui aliquid semel arripit.'

Kalendae 'The Calends'; *kalandae*, found e. g. in CIL. 5. 1682, 9. 1095, 10. 539, is perhaps the original form; it may be derived (just as I would derive the gerundive) from Pr. Ital. infin. **kalām* or **kalāom* (*√kal-*, cf. Gk. *καλέω*, Lat. *calō* of the 1st conjugation) + the suffix *-do-* 'giving the proclamation.' Compare Varro, L. L. 6, §27, Müll.: *primi dies nominati kalendae*, ab eo quod his diebus calantur eius mensis nonae a pontificibus, quintanae an septimanae sint futurae. It is fem. plur., in agreement with *dies* understood. The *e* of *kalendae* is difficult: perhaps *calo* may have been of the 3d conj. as well as of the 1st in very early Latin; cf. *lavo*, *iuvo*, which are of both 1st and 3d conjugation. Compare also *ē-legāns* beside *ē-ligere*.¹ This view

¹ Compare also Umbr. *portust* 'portaverit' beside *portatu* 'portato,' Osc. upsēd 'operatus est,' upsēns *οὐπσενσ* 'operaverunt,' etc., which Brugmann (Gr. II, §874) explains as probably built on the model of the primary *ā*-verbs with strong perfect (like Lat. *iuvāre iūvi*), which he supposes Umbr.-Osc. like

is supported by the Umbrian forms *kařetu kařitu carsitu* = 'calato, vocato' (*l* having become *d*, whence ř *rs*), on which Bücheler, *Umbr.*, p. 50, says: "*carsitu* discedit paulum a *calato*, magis congruit cum *calendis*."

LITHUANIAN: *gera-dėjis* 'benefactor' (cf. Lat. *benefactor*, *benefacio*, infra) and

visa-galīs (beside *vis-galīs*) 'all-powerful'; perhaps contain an accusative neuter governed by the second member (cf. Brugm., Gr. II, §46).

This kind of composition, wherein the first member is an accusative case governed by the second member, perhaps first took place in compounds with the finite verb, and was extended thence, e. g.

Latin crēdō (with Pr. Idg. √ *dhē-*) corresponding to *Sanskrit* *ṣrad-dadhāmi* from Idg. **kred*+*dhe-dhē-mi*. That the two members of the compound have not yet in Sanskrit become fused into an inseparable unity may be seen by such passages as *ṣrād asmāi dhatta* 'put your trust in him' (RV. ii 12. 5). That the verb governs the dative in Sanskrit and Latin is the natural outcome of its original meaning 'I lay my heart to,' hence 'put my trust in, believe.' Cf. Plaut. Am. I. I 284 sqq. *iniurato, scio, plus credet mihi, quam iurato tibi*.

Avestic yaoždath- (from *yaoš*+*dath-*, a reduplicated form of root *dā-* 'to make') and *yaoždā-* (from *yaoš* and root *dā-* 'to make') = 'to purify,' where *yaoš* (= Sanskrit *yōṣ*, n., Latin *ius*, n., cf. *iudex* from **iouz-dic-s* above) is really an accusative governed by the verbal root *dā-* (which may represent either Idg. √ *dhē-* or √ *dō-*).

Skr. mṛdā-ti 'is gracious, pardons,' *mṛdikā*, n. 'grace, pardon,' *Avestic mer'ždika*, n. 'grace, pardon,' the original form of which is probably an old syntactical combination **mṛḡḡ dō-* 'grant a purity (√ *merḡ-* 'wipe off') from sins'; *Skr. mṛḡḡ-ya-tē* 'forgets,' *marṣhayatē* 'bears patiently, ex-

Latin, to have had at one time; the *ā*-denominatives may have possibly adopted their mode of flexion, just as in Late Latin we find (pple.) *probitus*, (imperat.) *probunto* from *probāre*. We may perhaps compare also the Latin verbs which have the *ā*-flexion when compounded, but some other when not, e. g. *occupāre* beside *capīō*, *aspernāri* beside *spernō*, etc., which Brugmann (Gr. II, §583) explains as due to a difference in meaning, the *ā*-formations having an aoristic meaning, so that *occupāre* : *capīō* = Gk. *μαρῖναι* : *μαίνομαι*.

cuses, pardons,' *Lith. mirsz-ti* 'to forget,' which can equally well be regarded as being from an old **m̃rs dō-* (by assimilation **m̃rz dō-*) 'grant a forgetting, excuse' (Brugmann, Gr. I, §404, 1).

We may add

LATIN: *animum-adverto*, whence *animadverto*, from which arose *animadversio*.

bene-dico bene-facio male-dico male-facio (*bene* and *male* are very possibly primitive substantives in the accusative case which later became crystallized as adverbs; cf. beside *potis sum*, also *pote sum*, wherein *pote* is probably acc. sing. neut. for **poti*, crystallized already as adverb; we find also *bene sum* in the same way), whence *benedictio maledictio*.¹

sallo 'I salt,' from **sal-dō*.

nuncupō, perhaps from **nōmen-cupō* (for the latter half of the compound cf. *oc-cupō* : *capiō*); Brugmann, however (Gr. II, §34), derives it from **nōmi-cupō*; others, again, from **nōmine-cupō*.

palam-facio, if *palam perperam promiscam coram clam protinam multifariam*, etc., are really feminine accusatives from e. g. *perperus promiscus*, etc. (vide Osthoff, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIII 90 ff.). Brugmann, however (Gr. II, §276), seems inclined to regard them as instrumentals.

A compound verb formed from the Prim. Ital. infin. in *-m + √dō-* seems to me to be found in *venundō* 'I sell.'

Of *venum* Forcellini says: "Quidam putant esse supinum verbi *veneo*; sed potius *veneo* est a *venum*, quasi *venum eo*. Aliquando

¹ Brugmann, Gr. II, §275, 1, regards *bene male* as instrumentals.

We shall do well to compare the corresponding word to *bene* in Germanic: O. Eng. *wele*, AS. *wela*, Dan. *vel*, Sw. *väl*, OHG. *wola*, MHG. *wol*, NHG. *wohl*, are all found used both as subst. and as adv. corresponding to Modern English *weal* and *well*. We find the word also compounded like *bene*: In Danish, for instance, the substantival use of *vel* is manifest in *velhavende* (adj.) 'wealthy, prosperous,' lit. 'weal-having'; *velgiøren velgiører* correspond to Lat. *benefacere bene-factor*; *vel* is a pure adverb in *velbekient* (adj.) 'well-known.' In Dutch *wei* by itself is found only as an adverb; but a trace of its original substantival use is visible in *weldoën* 'benefacere,' *weldoener* 'benefactor.' In Gothic, on the other hand, *vaila* is used solely as an adverb, e. g. *thu is sunus meins sa liuba, in thuzei vaila galeikaida* 'thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased' (St. Mark, i. 11). Probably the adverbial use arose originally from compounded words, e. g. Latin *bene-dico*, pass. *bene-dictus*, whence *bene* came to be regarded as an adverb.

per casus inflexa legitur: itaque potius nomen esse dicendum est, cuius in usu frequentissimo est *venum*; dicimus autem *venum ire*, h. e. *vendi* 'to be exposed or set to sale,' *venum dare* aut *tradere*, h. e. *vendere* 'to sell, expose to sale.'"¹ *Venum* may perhaps be better explained as an old Prim. Ital. infin. = 'sale.'

The word *venum* is, I believe, the only form found in classical Latin of the so-called substantive *venum*. It is not until we come down to Tacitus that we find the form *veno*, e. g. Tac. Ann. XIII 51, XIV 15, and it is only still later that we find the form *venui*, App. M. 8, p. 210; id. 8, p. 221, 29. That *veno* and *venui* arose may be due to a misunderstanding of the origin of the word, owing to its isolated position.

Perhaps *pessumdo* may be explained in the same way, as a relic of the Prim. Ital. infin.

Venum do, originally = 'I give as a selling or a sale,' *venum* being in apposition to the object of *do*, or it may be equally well explained 'I give a selling (i. e. the sale of) some object,' e. g. Si pater filium ter *venum* duuit (? or davit) filius a patre liber esto, Leg. XII Tab., 'If a father thrice gives his son as a sale' (or 'the selling his son'). Hence *venum do* became gradually regarded as a unity = 'sell.' We find it both uncompounded and also compounded as *venumdo* or (just like the gerundive forms) *venundo* (cf. *vendo*, an abbreviated form for *venum do*, and *veneo* for *venum eo* 'I come as a sale,' i. e. 'am on sale').

Is it possible to find the primitive nominal infinitive also in compounds such as Latin *arē-facio* 'I make a heating, make warm,' cf. also *concale-facio* *fervē-facio* *contabē-facio* *liquē-facio*, etc.? These may have been for **arem-facio* **concalem-facio*, etc., in which the *e* was short because before a nasal + spirant (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §612). The *m* may have become lost,¹ because

¹ For the loss of *-m-* in these compound verbs we may compare the history of the numerals ending in *-em*, when in composition. The very definiteness required of a numeral served to keep these in their original form till far into the historical period, but in many instances they too succumbed eventually to this process of weakening (analogy of other numerals perhaps tending to influence them), e. g.

decimodiae beside *decemmodiae*
septicollis
septiformis
septimestris beside *septemmestris*
septipes
septiremis, etc.

in an unaccented syllable, e. g. *concale(m)-fácio* [cf. *homicida*, from *homin-* (the stem of *homo*) -*cida*, beside *homunculus*; cf. also *reccidi* from **réc(e)cidi*, *opilio* from **ov(i)pilio* (cf. Stolz, L. G.² §75)]. The variation, long *ē* beside *ē*, in these verbs may be due to 'compensatory lengthening' at the time of the loss of the *m*.¹ If this explanation of these verbs be right, we must suppose the origin to have been forgotten quite early, for we find in Cato: 'ferve bene facit'; Varro, R. R.: 'perferve ita fit,' 'excande me fecerunt'; Lucretius: 'facit are'; where there is no cause for loss of *m*, except perhaps in the second example from Varro, where *m* might have fallen out before the *m* in *me*.

The adjectives ending in *-ficus*, e. g. *arificus candificus languificus*, and those ending in *-dus*, e. g. *aridus candidus languidus*, etc. (given above), were formed on the model of the verbs when these latter had reached the forms in which they finally survived, e. g. *liquē-facio*; but owing to their losing all connection with the verbal system,² they went still further than the verbs, and changed their *e* to *i* (by rule cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §65).³ [We may contrast herewith the Aryan adjectives formed directly from accusative case of a substantive, governed by the suffix, e. g. RV. *dhīyaṃ-dhā-* (accusative from *dhī* 'thought' and root *dhā-*) 'thought-directing,' *dhīyaṃ-jinva-* 'devotion-promoting,' Avest. *yaozda* = probably 'giving purity,' hence 'pure' (cf. Lat. *lucidus* 'giving brightness,' hence 'bright'), *yaozdāna* = 'purifying.']

The intermediate stage is perhaps traceable in *septejugis*, Inscr. Grut. 337. 8, and *septer[esmos]* on the Columna Rostrata, C. I. L. I 195. *Novem* in composition seems to have been saved from this weakening process through fear of confusion with the derivatives of *novus*.

Compare also *faenugraecum*, Cael. Aur. acut. III 3. 16, 8. 78, beside *faenum-graecum*, Cato, R. R. 27. 1. *malogranatum*, Hier., Vulg., Th. Prisc., beside *malum granatum*, apud Col. XII 42. 1; Pliny, XIII 90, al.; in this compound, however, there is perhaps an assimilation to *mālōbathron*—which is really a Greek word—beside Lat. *malicorium*.

¹ Ritschl, Opusc. II 618 sqq., lays down the rule that in the scenic poets the *e* is long in verbs with long penult, short in verbs with short penult.

² May we compare French *complément*, English *complement*, in which the inherent meaning of the verb is still manifest, beside French *compliment*, English *compliment* (cf. New Eng. Dict.)? Eng. *compliment* came in through the French at the end of the 17th century, *complement* direct from Latin a century earlier.

³ A new group of verbs arose, based on these adjectives in *-ficus*, e. g. *candifico candificus*, *expergifico expergificus*.

They were no doubt originally spelt with *e*; this is supported by Umbr. *kaleřuf*, *calersu*, 'calidos' or 'callidos' (quoted above). The inscriptional forms *soledus* C. I. L. I 1166, X 5807 (153-89 B. C.), *splendedissimus* C. I. L. XIV 4144 (147 A. D.) and XIV 474 (circa 200 A. D.), and *provedus* C. I. L. XII 2153 (quite late) can hardly be brought as evidence.

With these verbs, if my explanation be right, we may perhaps compare the Sanskrit periphrastic perfect, which was made in its earliest use by prefixing the accusative of a derivative abstract noun (in *-ām*)¹ to the perfect tense of the root *kr̥*- 'to make,' e. g. *gamayām cakāra* (AV.). This accusative of the abstract noun must have become quite fossilized to allow of its later composition with the perfects of the roots *as*- and *bhū*- 'to be'; in composition with the former of which it became practically a 'word-unity' like the O. C. Sl. imperfects *vidě-achŭ děla-achŭ*; for example, *sāntvayāmāsa* 'he hushed, soothed' (M. Bh. Nala x 3).

I should mention, however, that Brugmann (Gr. II, §896, rem.) regards all these forms—Latin, Sanskrit and O. C. Sl.—as instrumentals.

The primitive nominal infinitive we may probably find also in such expressions as *ī-licet scī-licet vidē-licet* (which are not shortened forms from *īre-licet*, etc.) = 'the going, the knowing, the seeing is lawful.'²

If Brugmann may adduce evidence from the ROMANCE languages to support his explanation of the Latin pass. infin. in *-ier* (v. supra), the same course is open here to me as well. In the Romance languages we find the future indic. formed by an infinitive governed as object by *habeo*, e. g. French *aimerai* (Old French *amerai*), Italian *amerò*, Spanish *amaré*, from Latin *amare habeo*; French *chanterai*, Italian *canterò*, Spanish *cantaré*, from Latin *cantare habeo*. We also find in Spanish and Provençal the two parts separated, and not yet fused into an inseparable unity (cf. Max Müller, *Science of Lang.*, vol. I, p. 267), e. g. in Spanish, instead of *lo haré* 'I shall do it,' we find the more

¹ Delbrück, *Altind. Synt.* 426 f.

² This primitive infinitive is to be found also in the future infinitive in *-turum* (where, however, the infinitive is purely verbal, having lost its original nominal signification), e. g. *dicturum* from *dictū + erum* (= Umbr. *erom*, Osc. *ezum* 'to be'). This theory of Dr. Postgate (*Cl. Rev.* V 301) is accepted by Brugmann (Gr. II, §900).

primitive form *hacer lo he*, i. e. *facere id habeo*; and in Provençal *dir vos ai* instead of *je vous dirai*, *dir vos em* instead of *nous vous dirons*. *Habeo* governing an infin. as its object is not rare in Latin, e. g. Cic. pro Rosc. Amer., c. 35 *habeo etiam dicere, quem . . . de ponte in Tiberim deiecerit*; id. Epp. ad Att. II 22, 6, Epp. ad Fam. I 5; Varro, R. R. I 1, 2; Livy, XLIV, c. 22 *Illud affirmare pro certo habeo, audeoque*; Sil. I 16, 209 *Quare age, laetus habe nostros intrare penates* (v. l. *ave*); Valer. Flacc. I 1, 671; Tertull. de habitu mulier. 1, Apolog., c. 37; Lact. IV 12, 15; 18, 22; 30, 2.

5. Having thus endeavoured to prove that there is no real objection to the theory that the suffix *-do-* governs the first element of the compound as an object, let us return to *edum*. We have thus *edum* + *do-*, whence *edundo-*, + nominative masculine suffix *s*, whence *edundus*, and the change of *-undus* to *-endus* would be on the analogy of the present participle *edens edent-*. This theory will (just as well as Brugmann's theory) suit Oscan and Umbrian quite well on phonetic grounds, for *-nd-* becomes *nn* in Oscan, e. g.

úpsannam 'operandam.'

sakrannas 'sacrandas,' Rh. M. 45, 1.

eehiianasúm, of uncertain meaning, Rh. M. 43, p. 557 f., I,
with *n* instead of *nn*, as in Umbrian *pihaner* 'piandi.'

and *n* in Umbrian:

anferener 'circumferendi.'

pihaner 'piandi.'

Next as regards the *meaning* of the gerundive so derived. It may be asked why we have parallel forms such as

timi-du-s *timen-du-s*
horri-du-s *horren-du-s*
tumi-du-s *tumen-du-s*
etc., etc.

The answer to this objection is, that forms like *timidus*, etc., became already in Primitive Ital. regarded in the 'Sprachgefühl' so entirely as simple adjectives that they lost all connection with the original verb from which they came, and hence also in Primitive Ital. a new form destined to remain in connection with the verb and capable of governing a case like the verb *finite* had to be coined, and it was coined by means of the same suffix as the earlier form, hence *timendu-s* : *timi-du-s*.

Edendus, if my theory be right, will mean 'giving (or, if from $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ -, 'making, causing') the act-of-eating.' Thus *cibus est edendus* 'food is giving (causing) the act-of-eating,' i. e. 'the food may (must) be eaten.'

Roby (Latin Gr. II, p. lxxiv) mentions "two points, which, though certainly not conclusive, seem to afford some confirmation of the view, that the passive sense of the gerundive is really due to an attraction and not to any original passive meaning." His first point is that the agent with the gerundive is regularly expressed by the dative, whereas the agent with passive verbs is regularly expressed by the ablative with *ab*. The uses, it is true, do overlap, but only very slightly. He gives the statistics on pp. lxxiv and lxxv, and adds that in most cases where we find the agent after the gerundive expressed by the abl. with *ab*, the reason for the divergence from the ordinary construction is evident. It is in many cases due either (*a*) to a fear lest ambiguity should arise if the dative were used, or (*b*) to a desire to balance neighbouring clauses.

The second point to which Roby draws attention is that deponent verbs have the gerundive in full use just as much as other verbs. In none other of their forms have they a passive meaning, hence it is hardly likely that they have such a meaning in the gerundive.

Roby also shows that the use of some past participles of deponents, e. g. *testatus*, *meditatus*, etc., in both an active and passive sense, is far from parallel, for various reasons given on p. lxxvi.

Both these points which Roby mentions seem quite easily explicable by the theory which I have given of the origin of the gerundive:—

(*a*) The so-called 'dative of the agent after the gerundive' would turn out to be really an ethic dative, or better, 'dative of advantage,' after the idea of 'giving' in the suffix *do*-; e. g. *Aliorum iudicio permulta nobis et facienda et non facienda et mutanda et corrigenda sunt* (Cic. Off. I 41) 'In the opinion of others there are very many things which give (cause) us the doing, the non-doing, the changing and the correcting,' i. e. 'there are many things which we may or should do,' etc., i. e. 'which should be done by us,' etc.

(*β*) The deponent verbs may have a gerundive just as much as the active verbs. *Admirandus est* 'he gives a cause of wonderment,' the meaning is originally active, but it is obvious that

'he gives a cause of wonderment' is equivalent to 'he is to be wondered at.'

Next, to take an instance which does not fall under either (a) or (β), e. g. Oscan *trífbum ekak . . . úpsannam deded* (quoted above) 'he offered this building as giving or causing work,' i. e. 'gave this building to be worked or built.'

Thus, then, these forms in *-ndo-* were originally active, but from their use they shaded into a passive meaning, and hence came to be regarded as passives. The active meaning, however, is manifest in a few forms, all of which are intransitive.

Volvendus 'rolling,' or more literally 'giving a roll,' i. e. 'allowing of a roll,' occurs frequently, e. g. *plumbea glans longo cursu volvenda calescit*, *Lucr.* 6. 177; *secundus* 'that which gives the act of following,' hence 'following.' Cf. also *oriundus*, *iucundus* 'that which gives or allows pleasure,' hence 'pleasant'; cf. *Roby*, *Lat. Gr.*, p. lxxviii: "Though some of these (e. g. *oriundus*, *secundus*, *jucundus*) have become mere adjectives without any special verbal use, the meaning of a present participle appears clearly to be the original meaning with all. And this participle was not passive. The only words which could suggest a passive meaning are *volvendus*, *oriundus* and *rotundus*. But in the case of *volvendus*, Vergil has negated the necessity of the supposition by putting *volventibus annis* (*A.* 1. 234)¹ by the side of *volvendis mensibus* (*ib.* 269); and Lucretius speaks of *volventia lustra* (5. 931) as he does of *volvenda aetas* (*ib.* 1276); *oriundus* is from a deponent (comp. also *oriens*), and *rotundus* may be compared to *rotans* in Vergil's *saxa rotantia late Impulerat torrens* (*A.* 10. 362)."

That my translation of *volvendus*, etc., 'giving a roll,' etc., as applied to the substantive with which *volvendus*, etc., are in agreement, and as equivalent to 'rolling,' is perfectly defensible is shown by the frequent use of *dare* in this way in Lucretius, e. g. II 311 *dat motus* = 'facit motus, movetur'; II 1149 *dabunt labem putrisque ruinas* (said of the things themselves falling to ruin); and similarly V 347 *darent cladem magnasque ruinas*; cf. also *dare pausam* = 'facere pausam, cessare.' Vergil also uses *dare* thus, e. g. XII 575 *Dant cuneum* = 'They make themselves into a wedge.'

According to Max Müller (*Science of Language*, 2d series, p. 224), it is possible that here we have a trace of the $\sqrt{dhē}$. On this point v. *supra*. Compare the English expressions 'give a cry, a laugh, a shout, a cough, a start, a leap, a jump, a shudder,'

¹ Cf. περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν.

which simply mean 'cry, laugh, shout, cough, start, leap, jump, shudder,' as referring to the subject of the verb in question. We may add also Gk. ἐλδο-μαι from *Fελδο- (beside Lat. *vel-le*) 'give a wish,' whence 'wish'; μειδῶ (beside Skr. *smáy-a-te*) 'give a smile,' whence 'smile'; etc. (vide Brugmann, Gr. II, §695).

As regards the form of words like *rotundu-s*, *rubicundu-s* I would agree with Brugmann in his second theory (v. supra).

6. Having thus explained the gerundive both as to form and meaning, we are now in a position to examine the gerund. The gerund probably did not arise until such time as the infinitive had lost its use as a substantive, and had come to be used as essentially part of the verb. To supply the need thus created, the neuter singular of the gerundive was employed as an abstract substantive, both with the inherent meaning of the gerundive and also with the original meaning which the infinitive, whose place it was to fill, had while it was still a substantive, viz. *the abstract idea of the meaning indicated by the root of the word itself*. Like the gerundive, it is originally active in meaning; thus, *edendum est* 'there is an eating,' i. e. 'one may eat'; *eundum est* 'there is a going,' i. e. 'one may go'; *vir ad agendum idoneus* 'a man fit for doing'; *Gutta cavat lapidem non vi sed saepe cadendo* (Lucr.) 'The drop hollows the stone not by its violence, but by often falling.' Again, to take an example of a gerund with a case after it: *Domino est parendum* 'There is an obeying the lord,' i. e. 'the lord should be obeyed.' In all these we may still see the force of the *-do-* by translating literally, e. g. 'there is a giving (or causing) the act-of-giving,' i. e. 'one may or should go'; likewise 'a man fit for a giving-the-action,' i. e. 'for a chance of acting.'

The notion that the gerund is passive as well as active is based on its use in sentences such as e. g. (1) *anulus subter tenuatur habendo*, Lucretius 1. 312; (2) *equi ante domandum ingentes tollunt animos*, Verg. 9. 3. 206; (3) *cibus facillimus ad concoquendum*, Cic. Fin. 2. 28. But these are explicable in the same way: (1) 'A ring is worn away by giving or allowing the holding,' or by the abstract idea of 'holding,' which is indefinite—neither active nor passive; (2) 'Horses before "taming" or "before the giving a chance to tame" raise their spirits high'; (3) 'Food very easy for giving thorough cooking.' With regard to the first instance, '*anulus subter tenuatur habendo*,' taken in conjunction with the above-quoted '*Gutta cavat lapidem non vi sed saepe cadendo*' (also Lucretius), it may be worth while to compare

Ovid, p. 4, 10. 5 *Gutta cavat lapidem, consumitur anulus usu*, obviously a reminiscence (or a plagiarism) of Lucretius. Ovid thus uses the abstract word *usu* as equivalent to the *habendo* of Lucretius, thus showing how easily the gerund, though originally active both in form and meaning, could nevertheless shade off into an apparently quasi-passive meaning.

7. It will be well to add the possibility (pace Brugmann) that, after all, the gerund was the earlier formation, and the gerundive the later. It is true that we find no instance of the gerund in the Umbrian-Samnite monuments; but they are scarcely sufficiently extensive to enable us to assume therefrom that the gerundive was *necessarily* the earlier formation of the two. Moreover, as mentioned above, the gerund is more frequent than the gerundive in Early Latin.

My explanation of the form will fit equally well with this view.¹ Thus, e. g., the gerund *agendum* would have been formed as a substantive with the meaning 'that which gives action,' or more abstract still (as it was to take the place in Latin of the vanished infin. in *-m*), 'action.' Then to *agendum* was built the adjective *agendus* = 'giving action,' which may have arisen originally from cases where *agendum* was the predicate, e. g. *hoc est agendum* 'this is a thing giving (or causing) action,' where *agendum* was misunderstood as an adjective.

Again, take a deponent verb *admirandum est* 'it is a wonder,' whence *admirandus est* 'he is a wonder,' i. e. 'wonderful.'

It may be said that this explanation falls to the ground because in Umbrian-Samnite these Prim. Ital. infinitives in *-m* survive, and that therefore no gerund was needed to take their place as in Latin. *But they do not survive with their primitive meaning of abstract nouns*; they have become thoroughly incorporated in the verb-system, and show no trace of their original meaning as substantives; and therefore there is no reason why a gerund should not have existed in Umbrian-Samnite, even though we have none actually preserved to us in the surviving monuments.

However, all said and done, I still adhere to my former view that the gerundive was the earlier formation of the two.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENG.

L. HORTON-SMITH.

¹ Or, inasmuch as there is nothing to show the original quantity of *-dum* on this theory, it might therefore be itself an infinitive = **da-om*, **dha-om*, etc., but still governing the first member of the compound as its object.